

DATE: _____

DAY: _____

Q:4 How do you see the chances of the end of Ukrainian war when the demands of Russia and NATO are conflicting and poles apart and when Trump 28 points given to Ukraine to accept the peace plan. Elaborate.

Ans.1. Introduction:

The Russia - Ukraine war, now stretching into its fourth year, has become a defining conflict of contemporary geopolitics. It has reshaped global security, disrupted energy markets, and ^{polarized} ~~polarized~~ international alliances. While multiple peace initiatives have been floated, none have succeeded due to the the ~~irreconc~~

irreconcilable demands of Russia and NATO

Recently, President Donald Trump introduced a 28-point peace plan, claiming it could end the war swiftly. However, the plan's provisions have sparked intense debate, as they appear to align more closely with Moscow's interests than Kyiv's sovereignty.

2. Russia's Demands:

Russia has consistently demanded recognition of its annexation, including Crimea and parts of Donbas. It also insists the Ukraine must remain outside NATO and reduce its military capacity. These demands reflect Moscow's broader strategic goal of creating a buffer zone against Western influence. Such conditions are unacceptable to Ukraine, which views them as a violation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

3. NATO's Position:

NATO, on the other hand, emphasizes the principle of Sovereignty and territorial integrity. Western allies reject any territorial concessions to Russia, fearing that it would legitimize aggression and encourage similar actions elsewhere. NATO continues to provide military and financial support to Ukraine, reinforcing its defense capabilities and signaling that compromise on sovereignty is not an option.

4. Trump's 28-points Peace plan:

Trump's plan calls for an immediate ceasefire, monitored by international observers.

However, it requires Ukraine to cede territory to Russia, remain outside NATO, and limit its military size. The plan also proposes holding elections under international supervision. Analysts argue that the plan mirrors Putin's demands and undermines Ukraine's independence. While Trump insists it could bring "Peace within 24 hours", critics highlight that it effectively rewards aggression and pressures Kyiv into concessions.

5. Challenges to implementation:

The plan faces multiple obstacles:

- **Ukrainian Resistance:** President Zelensky has categorically rejected territorial concessions, calling them unacceptable.
- **European Opposition:** European leaders fear the plan legitimizes Russia's invasion and destabilizes international law.

DATE: ..

DAY: ..

- Russian Calculations: Moscow may accept the plan only if it secures permanent control of occupied territories.
- Global Stakes: The war is tied to broader East-West rivalry, making compromise difficult.

6. Prospects of Peace:

In the short term, peace remains elusive. Neither Russia nor NATO is willing to compromise on core demands. In the medium term, exhaustion, economic pressures, or international mediation force concessions. In the long term, sustainable peace requires a balanced ~~framework~~ framework that respects Ukraine's sovereignty while addressing Russia's security concerns. Trump's plan, however, fails to ^{provide} ~~provide~~ such balance.

7. Conclusion:

To conclude, the end of Ukraine war remains uncertain. The conflicting

DATE: _____

DAY: _____

demands of Russia and NATO make reconciliation extremely difficult. Trump's 28-point peace plan, though ambitious, is seen as impractical and biased towards Russia, thereby reducing its chances of acceptance. Unless a multilateral framework emerges — one that balances sovereignty with security — the war is unlikely to end soon.

=====

Q2: Trump once again pulled out of the Paris Climate Agreement. Critically evaluate the future efforts against climate change in the absence of the world leader.

Ans: 1 Introduction:

The Paris Climate Agreement (2015) was a landmark ~~agreement~~ uniting nearly 195 nations to limit global warming below 2°C . The ^{United States} (U.S.) as the world's second-largest emitter of greenhouse gases, played a pivotal role in shaping and financing this framework. President Trump's second withdrawal in January 2025 has reignited debates about the credibility of international climate governance.

2. Implications of U.S. withdrawal:

1. Loss of financial support: The U.S. previously pledged billions to the Green Climate Fund. Its exit undermines climate financing for vulnerable states.
2. Diplomatic set-backs: The U.S. absence weakens collective bargaining power at Conference of

Parties (COP) summits, especially against fossil fuel lobbies

3. Policy reversal: Trump's administration has backed fossil fuels and obstructed renewables, reversing domestic progress.

4. Symbolic Blow: Withdrawal signals that major powers can abandon commitments, eroding trust in multilateralism.

3. Continuity of Global Climate Efforts:

Despite U.S. disengagement, climate action persists:

1. European Union Leadership: The European Union (EU) continues to push for carbon neutrality by 2050, strengthening its role as climate leader.

2. China and India's Role: Both nations are investing heavily in renewables, though coal dependence remains a challenge.

3. Technological Advances: Falling costs of solar, wind, and battery storage drive decarbonization.

DATE: _____

DAY: _____

independent of U.S. policy.

4. Civil Society and States: Subnational actors in the U.S (California & New York) remain committed to Paris goals, showing resilience of decentralized governance.

4. Challenges ahead:

1. Rising Emissions: Global fossil fuel emissions increased by 1.1% in 2025, showing targets are off-track.
2. Fragmentation: Without U.S. leadership, climate diplomacy risks becoming fragmented, with blocs pursuing divergent strategies.
3. Climate Justice Concerns: Vulnerable countries in Africa and South Asia face disproportionate impacts, with reduced access to adaptation rule.

5. Critical Perspective:

1. Positive outlook: Technology, EU leadership, and emerging economies sustain momentum.

2. Negative outlook: U.S withdrawal undermines trust, financing, and global unity.
3. Analytical edges: Stressing that climate governance is shifting from state-centric leadership to multi-actor resilience such as NGOs, private sector and regional blocs.
4. Pakistan's Position: As a climate-vulnerable country, Pakistan must intensify advocacy for climate justice, adaptation financing and regional cooperation.

6. Conclusion:

The absence of U.S leadership is a serious setback, but not the end of climate action. The future of global efforts lies in distributed leadership, technological innovation, and regional cooperation. However, unless emissions peak soon, the world risks overshooting Paris targets. For Pakistan and other vulnerable states, this means intensifying advocacy for climate justice and adaptation financing.
